UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,510	02/16/2006	Jan Buberl	06900128PUS1	1191
	7590 06/17/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747		BROOKS, KRISTIE LATRICE		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1616		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/568,510	BUBERL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KRISTIE L. BROOKS	1616	

	KRISTIE L. BROOKS	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. 🛛 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	102(b) rejection over prior art refe	rence, Hara et al	•
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			t canceling the
7. 🛛 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		l be entered and an ex	planation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	rided below or appended.		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ((PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/PORFIRIO NAZARIO Primary Examiner, Art U		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not deemed convincing. Applicant argues that the growth regulation is distinguished from the pesticidal action. These arguments are not persuasive. Eicken et al. teach the same instant compounds being applied to plants in the same effective amount. Thus, one of ordinary skil in the art would assume that the compounds taught in the prior art would have the same regulating growth effect as instantly claimed. Applicant further argues that Example 1 proves that growth regulating effect can be achieved compared to untreated onion plants, although no fungal disease were present.. Example 1 of the instant speicification (see page 15) describes the spray application of the instant compounds to onions. The crop yield of the treated onions were increased by 4.2% compared to the untreated plot. This date is not convincing. The data provided by Applicant does not establish an growth regulating effect beyond what is already known. The instant compounds increased the yield of the onion crop compared to untreated plots and little or no fungal diseases were present. This is expected since the instant compounds are known fungicides. And it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that an increased yield would result from treatment of a crop susceptible to fungal diseases compared to the untreated crop. Therefore, Applicants arguments are not convincing.